



TITLE:

Predation risk increases dispersal distance in prey.

AUTHOR(S):

Otsuki, Hatsune; Yano, Shuichi

CITATION:

Otsuki, Hatsune ...[et al]. Predation risk increases dispersal distance in prey.. *Naturwissenschaften* 2014, 101(6): 513-516

ISSUE DATE:

2014-06

URL:

<http://hdl.handle.net/2433/199893>

RIGHT:

The final publication is available at Springer via <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00114-014-1181-3>; この論文は出版社版ではありません。引用の際には出版社版をご確認ご利用ください。 ; This is not the published version. Please cite only the published version.

1 **Predation risk increases dispersal distance in prey**

2

3 Hatsune Otsuki ^{a*}, Shuichi Yano ^a

4 ^a Laboratory of Ecological Information, Graduate School of Agriculture, Kyoto University, Kyoto

5 606-8502, Japan

6 * Corresponding author: ootsuki.hatsune.44e@st.kyoto-u.ac.jp

7 Tel & fax: +81-75-753-6144

8 Abstract

9

10 Understanding the ecological factors that affect dispersal distances allows us to predict the
11 consequences of dispersal. Although predator avoidance is an important cause of prey dispersal, its
12 effects on dispersal distance have not been investigated. We used simple experimental setups to test
13 dispersal distances of the ambulatory dispersing spider mite (*Tetranychus kanzawai*) in the presence
14 or absence of a predator (*Neoseiulus womersleyi*). In the absence of predators, most spider mites
15 settled in adjacent patches, whereas the majority of those dispersing in the presence of predators
16 passed through adjacent patches and settled in distant ones. This is the first study to experimentally
17 demonstrate that predators induce greater dispersal distance in prey.

18

19 Keywords

20 Conditional dispersal, dispersal distance, antipredator behavior, settlement decision, spider mite

21

22 Introduction

23

24 Dispersal ecology aims to elucidate how ecological factors affect the dispersal processes of
25 organisms. Although dispersal consists of three distinct phases—departure, transfer and settlement
26 (Clobert et al. 2009)—most theoretical and empirical studies have focussed only on departure

27 (Bowler and Benton 2005). However, while departure rate is informative, dispersal distances
28 post-departure are necessary to predict the full consequences of dispersal (Travis et al. 2013). The
29 ability of individuals to reach and settle into a suitable habitat patch can determine the fate of their
30 populations, and thus the species (Kokko and Lopez-Sepulcre 2006; Travis et al. 2013), which is
31 especially true when faced with increasing habitat fragmentation and climate change. Therefore,
32 understanding the ecological factors influencing dispersal distance is of crucial importance in
33 changing environments.

34 Actively dispersing organisms depart their natal patches, making decisions based on
35 dispersal costs and benefits (Bonte et al. 2012). Once individuals have reached a potential patch, they
36 must decide whether to settle or to continue searching for more suitable patches based on the costs
37 and benefits of further dispersal (Bonte et al. 2012). The primary benefit of dispersal is leaving a
38 patch with relatively lower fitness expectations due to resource deterioration and/or kin competition
39 (Hamilton and May 1977). An increasing number of theoretical studies have investigated the
40 influences of these factors on the evolution of dispersal distance (e.g. Rousset and Gandon 2002;
41 Poethke et al. 2011). Furthermore, empirical studies have demonstrated that density and/or kin
42 competition induces plasticity for dispersal distance in actively dispersing organisms such as small
43 mammals (Ims and Andreassen 2005) and herbivorous mites (Bitume et al. 2013).

44 A further benefit of dispersal is predator avoidance (Lima and Dill 1990). Because
45 individuals dispersing from an invaded patch must avoid being tracked by predators (Lima and Dill

1990), predators may affect not only the probability of departure (e.g. McCauley and Rowe 2010), but also patch settlement decisions and dispersal distances of prey. However, to our knowledge, only a few studies have considered the effects of predators on prey dispersal distances (Tamaki et al. 1970; Weisser et al. 1999; Meng et al. 2012). Tamaki et al. (1970) compared spatial distributions of apterous aphid populations in the presence or absence of parasitoids, and inferred that those aphids dispersed a greater distance if they encountered parasitoids. Similarly, Weisser et al. (1999) demonstrated that predators induced winged offspring in aphids, suggesting predator-induced long-distance dispersal. However, Meng et al. (2012) did not detect increased dispersal distances in adult whiteflies in the presence of predators. The scarcity of studies examining dispersal distances of prey organisms may be due largely to the difficulty in tracking flying organisms that disperse great distances.

To facilitate observation of the prey dispersal process, we used the ambulatory dispersing spider mite *Tetranychus kanzawai* Kishida (Acari: Tetranychidae) and its native predator *Neoseiulus womersleyi* Schicha (Acari: Phytoseiidae). Spider mites in the genus *Tetranychus* are major agricultural pests living in protective webs on leaf surfaces (Saito 1983). In response to plant deterioration, mated females disperse, mainly by walking to a new plant (Brandenburg and Kennedy 1982). However, specialist predatory mites, such as *N. womersleyi*, that can penetrate these webs also promote the dispersal of spider mites (e.g. Bernstein 1984; Grostal and Dicke 1999). Since such predators are used as biological control agents against spider mites (Sabelis and Bakker 1992),

65 understanding their effects on the prey dispersal process is also of economic importance.

66 Here, we tested the hypothesis that spider mites perceiving a predation risk disperse farther
67 than those dispersing in response to resource deterioration. This is the first experimental
68 demonstration of predators increasing dispersal distances in prey organisms.

69

70 **Material and methods**

71

72 We collected *T. kanzawai* from narrow-leaved vetch (*Vicia sativa* subsp. *nigra* L.; Fabaceae) in
73 Kyoto, Japan. Individuals were maintained on kidney bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.; hereafter “bean”)
74 leaf discs pressed onto water-saturated cotton in Petri dishes (90 mm in diameter, 14 mm in depth).
75 We collected *N. womersleyi* individuals from *Rosa centifolia* L. (Rosaceae) in Nara, Japan.
76 Individuals were reared on bean leaf discs heavily infested with *T. urticae* as prey. All rearing and
77 experiments were conducted under 25°C, 50% relative humidity and an L16:D8 photoperiod.

78 Our experimental setup contained three connected leaf patches (Fig. 1a). We introduced a
79 mated 2-day-old female spider mite onto a 10 × 10 mm bean leaf square (initial patch) and allowed
80 her to build webs for 24 h. We then introduced an adult female predatory mite onto the initial patch
81 (predator present), while setups without a predator served as controls (predator absent). Since we
82 intended to examine spider mite dispersal in response to a predator staying in the initial patch,
83 predators were fed only water for the previous 48 h, as they remain in the initial patch containing

84 abundant spider mite eggs longer than predators with previous access to food (SY, unpublished data).
85 After allowing the predators to acclimate for 30 min, we connected the initial patch to two other
86 consecutive leaf squares (second and third patches) with 10×30 mm Parafilm bridges. This setup
87 was surrounded by water-saturated cotton to prevent mites from escaping.

88 We recorded the location and state of spider mites every 24 h until each had dispersed to
89 either of the two consecutive patches. We identified which patch each spider mite first settled; we
90 considered a patch as settled if it contained webs, injury scars, eggs and faeces of spider mites,
91 regardless of the mites' presence. We excluded the data when predatory mites intruded into
92 consecutive patches.

93 To confirm that female spider mites were not attracted to bean leaves at a distance of 30 mm
94 (as examined above), we connected a leaf and a Parafilm square (10×10 mm each) with a T-shaped
95 Parafilm pathway (Fig. 1b) and introduced a female spider mite ($N=60$) at the bottom of the pathway.
96 The number of females that moved in each direction from the T-junction did not significantly differ
97 from equality (leaf:control, 28:32; binomial test, $P=0.70$) (Fig. 1b). Therefore, dispersing spider
98 mites were considered to have abandoned the previous patch, as opposed to having been attracted to
99 adjacent patches, and that dispersal between patches connected with nonfood substrates could
100 simulate ambulatory mite dispersal between remote patches.

101

102 Results

103

104 The mean time (day \pm SE) before spider mites began dispersing was significantly shorter in the
105 presence of predators (1.3 \pm 0.11) than in their absence (5.8 \pm 0.30; Mann–Whitney *U*-test, $P<0.0001$),
106 suggesting that spider mite dispersal is dependent on predators. If predators are absent, dispersal is
107 seemingly triggered by resource deterioration, but if predators are present, they become important
108 dispersal motivators. This was consistent with results of previous studies reporting higher spider mite
109 departure rates in the presence of specialist predatory mites (e.g. Bernstein 1984; Grostal and Dicke
110 1999). Furthermore, we showed that most spider mites dispersing in the absence of predators settled
111 in adjacent (second) patches, whereas the majority of those dispersing in the presence of predators
112 settled in distant (third) patches (Fisher's exact test, $P=0.0020$) (Fig. 2). Thus, we experimentally
113 demonstrated that predators increase prey departure rate and dispersal distance.

114

115 Discussion

116

117 In general, dispersing organisms adjust their behaviours based on the costs and benefits of dispersal
118 (Bonte et al. 2012). That is, an individual that has reached a potential patch has the option to remain
119 or to continue dispersing. Our results, showing that most prey individuals settled in adjacent patches
120 in the absence of predators, support published theoretical research (Poethke et al. 2011). These
121 authors predicted that dispersing individuals should settle in adjacent patches unless the cost of

122 between-patch dispersal is extremely low because the costs of resource competition should
123 sufficiently decrease after one dispersal step. Although dispersal costs were not simulated in our
124 experiments, the average costs of between-patch dispersal that spider mites should incur in the wild
125 may be considerable because their webs serve as refuges from numerous predators (Yano 2012) and
126 spider mites in the open are extremely vulnerable. Our results imply that ignoring the first
127 encountered patch is disadvantageous for spider mites when the predation risk by specialist predatory
128 mites is low. Conversely, prey individuals dispersing greater distances in response to predators may
129 benefit from escaping predators, not only because they move farther away from the invaded patch,
130 but also because the probability of being tracked by predators substantially decreases with every
131 between-patch dispersal event in the wild, where multiple dispersal directions are available. We
132 showed that the majority of spider mites dispersing in the presence of specialist predatory mites
133 passed through adjacent patches without settling, which implies that the benefits of greater dispersal
134 distances under predation risk may outweigh the average costs of dispersal.

135 In contrast to departure rate, the ecological factors that influence dispersal distance are less
136 understood. This is the first empirical study to demonstrate that predators induce greater dispersal
137 distance in individual prey. Thus, both the departure rate (Bowler and Benton 2005) and dispersal
138 distance appear to be affected by predation risk. Fronhofer et al. (2014) empirically and theoretically
139 demonstrated that spatially correlated local extinctions select for long-distance dispersal. Contrary to
140 unpredictable extinction events such as disease outbreak (Muller-Landau et al. 2003) and habitat

141 fragmentation (Kallimanis et al. 2006), extinctions of local spider mite populations by specialist
142 predators should be predictable because individuals can perceive intruding predators (e.g. Bernstein
143 1984; Grostal and Dicke 1999); therefore, conditional dispersal strategies in response to the presence
144 of predators, as observed in our study, would be more advantageous than fixed strategies insensitive
145 to predation risk.

146 Our results imply that the distribution of dispersal distances (dispersal kernel) measured in
147 the absence of predators (Bitume et al. 2013; Fronhofer et al. 2014) should be significantly different
148 when predators are present. Further empirical studies are required to understand how greater
149 dispersal distances in response to predation risk contribute to the stability of prey populations and
150 how this in turn influences the effectiveness of predators in suppressing prey populations. Addressing
151 these questions would allow us to predict invasion rates of a prey species expanding its range (Kokko
152 and Lopez-Sepulcre 2006), and in particular, insights into these issues regarding mite predator–prey
153 interactions could contribute to the successful biological control of spider mites.

154

155 **Acknowledgments**

156

157 We thank three anonymous reviewers for thoughtful suggestions, and members of the Laboratory of
158 Ecological Information for valuable suggestions and encouragement.

159

160 **References**

161

162 Bernstein C (1984) Prey and predator emigration responses in the acarine system *Tetranychus*
163 *urticae-Phytoseiulus persimilis*. *Oecologia* 61:134–142. doi: 10.1007/BF00379099

164 Bitume EV, Bonte D, Ronce O, Bach F, Flaven E, Olivieri I, Nieberding CM (2013) Density and
165 genetic relatedness increase dispersal distance in a subsocial organism. *Ecol Lett* 16:430–437.
166 doi: 10.1111/ele.12057

167 Bonte D, Van Dyck H, Bullock JM et al (2012) Costs of dispersal. *Biol Rev* 87:290–312. doi:
168 10.1111/j.1469-185X.2011.00201.x

169 Bowler DE, Benton TG (2005) Causes and consequences of animal dispersal strategies: relating
170 individual behaviour to spatial dynamics. *Biol Rev* 80:205–225.
171 doi: 10.1017/S1464793104006645

172 Brandenburg RL, Kennedy GG (1982) Intercrop relationships and spider mite dispersal in a
173 corn/peanut agroecosystem. *Entomol Exp Appl* 32:269–276.
174 doi:10.1111/j.1570-7458.1982.tb03217.x

175 Clobert J, Le Galliard JF, Cote J, Meylan S, Massot M (2009) Informed dispersal, heterogeneity in
176 animal dispersal syndromes and the dynamics of spatially structured populations. *Ecol Lett*
177 12:197–209. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01267.x

178 Fronhofer EA, Stelz JM, Lutz E, Poethke HJ, Bonte D (2014) Spatially correlated extinctions select

- 179 for less emigration but larger dispersal distances in the spider mite *Tetranychus urticae*.
- 180 Evolution (in press) doi: 10.1111/evo.12339
- 181 Grostal P, Dicke M (1999) Direct and indirect cues of predation risk influence behavior and
- 182 reproduction of prey: a case for acarine interactions. Behav Ecol 10:422–427.
- 183 doi: 10.1093/beheco/10.4.422
- 184 Hamilton WD, May RM (1977) Dispersal in stable habitats. Nature 269:578–581
- 185 Ims RA, Andreassen HP (2005) Density-dependent dispersal and spatial population dynamics. Proc
- 186 R Soc B Biol Sci 272:913–918. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2004.3025
- 187 Kallimanis AS, Kunin WE, Halley JM, Sgardelis SP (2006) Patchy disturbance favours longer
- 188 dispersal distance. Evol Ecol Res 8:529–541
- 189 Kokko H, Lopez-Sepulcre A (2006) From individual dispersal to species ranges: Perspectives for a
- 190 changing world. Science 313:789–791. doi: 10.1126/science.1128566
- 191 Lima SL, Dill LM (1990) Behavioral decisions made under the risk of predation: a review and
- 192 prospectus. Can J Zool 68:619–640. doi: 10.1139/z90-092
- 193 McCauley SJ, Rowe L (2010) *Notonecta* exhibit threat-sensitive, predator-induced dispersal. Biol
- 194 Lett 6:449–452. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2009.1082
- 195 Meng R-X, Sabelis MW, Janssen A (2012) Limited predator-induced dispersal in whiteflies. PLoS
- 196 ONE 7:e45487. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0045487
- 197 Muller-Landau HC, Levin SA, Keymer JE (2003) Theoretical perspectives on evolution of

- 198 long-distance dispersal and the example of specialized pests. *Ecology* 84:1957–1967. doi:
- 199 10.1890/01-0617
- 200 Poethke HJ, Gros A, Hovestadt T (2011) The ability of individuals to assess population density
- 201 influences the evolution of emigration propensity and dispersal distance. *J Theor Biol* 282:93–
- 202 99. doi: 10.1016/j.jtbi.2011.05.012
- 203 Rousset F, Gandon S (2002) Evolution of the distribution of dispersal distance under
- 204 distance-dependent cost of dispersal. *J Evol Biol* 15:515–523.
- 205 doi: 10.1046/j.1420-9101.2002.00430.x
- 206 Sabelis MW, Bakker FM (1992) How predatory mites cope with the web of their tetranychid prey: a
- 207 functional view on dorsal chaetotaxy in the Phytoseiidae. *Exp Appl Acarol* 13:203–225. doi:
- 208 10.1007/BF01193804
- 209 Saito Y (1983) The concept of “life types” in Tetranychinae. An attempt to classify the spinning
- 210 behaviour of Tetranychinae. *Acarologia* 24:377–391
- 211 Tamaki G, Halfhill JE, Hathaway DO (1970) Dispersal and reduction of colonies of pea aphids by
- 212 *Aphidius smithi* (Hymenoptera: Aphidiidae). *Ann Entomol Soc Am* 63:973–980
- 213 Travis JMJ, Delgado M, Bocedi G et al (2013) Dispersal and species’ responses to climate change.
- 214 *Oikos* 122:1532–1540. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0706.2013.00399.x
- 215 Weisser WW, Braendle C, Minoretti N (1999) Predator-induced morphological shift in the pea aphid.
- 216 *Proc R Soc B* 266:1175–1181. doi: 10.1098/rspb.1999.0760

- 217 Yano S (2012) Cooperative web sharing against predators promotes group living in spider mites.
- 218 Behav Ecol Sociobiol 66:845–853. doi: 10.1007/s00265-012-1332-5

219 **Figure captions**

220

221 **Fig. 1 a** An experimental setup to investigate whether spider mites settle in adjacent (second) patches
222 or continue to distant (third) patches in the presence or absence of predators. **b** An experiment to
223 confirm that female spider mites are not attracted to bean leaves at a distance of 30 mm.

224

225 **Fig. 2** The proportion of spider mites that settled in adjacent (second) or distant (third) patches.
226 Significantly more spider mites that encountered predatory mites settled in distant patches than those
227 dispersing in response to resource deterioration (Fisher's exact test). Replicate numbers are shown in
228 bars.

229

230

231 The English in this document has been checked by at least two professional editors, both native
232 speakers of English. For a certificate, please see:

233

234 <http://www.textcheck.com/certificate/jBnzyo>




Fig. 1




Fig. 2